

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

**Question 21, Reference ATPD, Paragraph # Table II**

**Statement:** In the Annex J section of Table II, for line item "Reliability & Maintainability", an "X" appears in the "FPT" column. In the past, RAM has not been evaluated in FPTs due to small sample size and low miles. Statistically valid conclusions cannot be obtained under such conditions.

**Question 21A:** What is the Government's rationale for including RAM as an evaluation factor for FPTs?

**Answer 21A:** *Although we are running RAM miles, we are not evaluating those miles to RAM scoring.*

**Question 21B:** Will the Government consider deleting RAM as an evaluation factor for FPTs?

**Answer 21B:** *No. See Question 21A*

**Question 28, Reference ATPD, Paragraph # 4.3.2.1 & 4.7.24**

Title: Reliability Conformance

**Statement:** Paragraph 4.3.2.1.1 ends with the phrase: "... utilizing test data (i.e., Test Incident Reports (TIRs))." The second-to-last sentence in paragraph 4.3.2.1.2 ends with the phrase: "recorded in the final test report." Paragraph 4.7.24 has similar language to 4.3.2.1.1. Typically, TIRs and final test reports do not report the results of RAM Assessment Conference(s) which typically follow RAM Scoring Conferences (Ref: AR 702-3).

**Question 28:** Will at least one RAM Assessment Conference be convened following the final Scoring Conference to assess RAM growth as a result of effective corrective actions introduced into the PQT?

**Answer 28:** *Yes.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

**Question 34, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.1.2.3-1**

Title: Contractor Phase II Proposed Changes

**Statement:** In point one it is stated that “Contractor may have proposed new changes .....or in response to Government baseline Phase I Test Incident reports(TIRs). Contractors were not allowed to make changes to their test trucks after 12/21/01. Furthermore, no changes were allowed in Phase I testing to baseline TDP TIRs (Legacy TIRs).

**Question 34A:** Does this statement now mean that contractors can propose changes for legacy TIRs, discovered in Phase I testing, in their Phase II proposal?

**Answer 34A:** *Yes. Please refer to PCO letter dated 11 April 2002.*

**Question 34B:** If contractors are allowed to propose changes in their Phase II proposal based on Government baseline TIRs, will both contractors be provided all legacy TIRs for both RAM and Performance trucks that occurred on all 16 Phase I test trucks?

**Answer 34B:** *No.*

**Question 34C:** If a contractor offers an ECP for a legacy TIR that was found in Phase I testing, will a different risk factor be used for these new ECPs since the contractor was not allowed to incorporate these changes on the Phase I test vehicles for verification?

**Answer 34C:** *Yes, risk will be assessed based upon analysis of the ECP(s) and supporting documentation supplied therein.*

**Question 40, Reference Draft RFP, Section E, Paragraph E.7, “Product Quality Deficiency Reports”**

**Question 40:** Enclosed is what we consider to be an improvement to the referenced paragraph for your consideration.

“E.7 Product Quality Deficiency Reports (PQDR). The Contractor shall investigate, provide failure analysis and corrective action to all PQDRs, Standard Form 368, generated against supplies produced under this contract in accordance with OT-90-12220 (CDRL A082). The Contractor shall provide a report of the investigation, root cause, and a proposed corrective action plan within 20 calendar days of receipt of a Category I

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

PQDR and within 30 calendar days of receipt of a Category II PQDR. Should the Contractor require an exhibit from the field, the Contractor shall coordinate with the Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO) to arrange for transportation of the deficient items identified in the PQDR. The cost of the transportation is the responsibility of the Contractor. All corrective actions taken by the Contractor shall be at no additional cost to the Government. The Government PCO must approve all corrective actions requiring configuration changes.

**Answer 40:** *This paragraph is currently under review for changes which will be incorporated in the final RFP.*

**Question 53, Reference ATPD, Page 81**

**Paragraph # C.4.1.4**

Title: Waterproofness and Sealing Test

**Statement:** Both paragraphs C.4.1.4 and H.4.1.3 require that the conformance to water resistance or leakage is to be evaluated per MIL-STD-810E Section II, para. 3.3, Procedure III – Water tightness, except for the test duration which was limited to 15 minutes.

**Question 53A:** Is the correct inspection method to verify the conformance of this requirement the Rain Test (MIL-STD-810E, Method 506.3, Section II, paragraph 3.3, Procedure III (Watertightness))?

**Answer 53A:** *Please see answer to Question 17.*

**Question 53B:**

Given the reference to MIL-STD-810 in paragraph 2.3.3 of the ATPD, why wouldn't the current version of MIL-STD-810DF be used to confirm compliance of this requirement?

**Answer 53B:** *Please see answer to Question 17.*

**Question 53C:** If MIL-STD-810F were used, will paragraphs C.4.1.4 and H.4.1.3 be revised to reflect the same reference (MIL-STD-810, Method 506.4, paragraph 4.4.3 – Procedure II – Watertightness)?

**Answer 53C:** *Please see answer to Question 17.*

**Question 66, Reference ATPD 2131C**

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

**Question 66:** ATPD 2131C references AWS D1.3 - 70. This spec is not referenced on the American Welding Society website. AWS C1.1M/C1.1:2000 and C1.4M/C1.4:1999 have similar titles, but not exactly the same. Please clarify if these are the superceding documents.

**Answer 66:** *There is no reference to D1.3 70 in the ATPD. There is a reference for C1.3-70 that is for Resistance Welding of Coated Low Carbon Steels. AWS D1.3-89 is for Structural Sheet Steel. All of the AWS welding codes can be obtained by contacting AWS customer service @ (305) 443-9353, EXT 280.*

**Question 249, Reference: ATPD, Page 93, Paragraph # E.2.6**

Title: Main Recovery Winch System

**Statement:** The Final Report for Production Verification Test (PVT) of the Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles (FTMV) dated June 2000 was provided as Attachment 21 of the Phase I FMTV A1CR contract. There were some deficiencies noted for the main winch system for the M1089A1 (Ref. Paragraph 2.21.5). A question on this issue was submitted during Phase I (Ref Question Set 11, PAT-41) where the answer provided stated that a retest was conducted at the manufacturer's facility and the issue was closed.

**Question 249A:** What change or changes were made to the M1089A1 to address this issue and allow it to comply with the requirements?

**Answer 249A:** *No changes were made. The retest indicated the winch did not meet the high speed load requirements, however, the user accepted this based on it's low operational impact. The winch requirements will be updated for the Final RFP to reflect winch performance test results.*

**Question 249B:** Are all these changes reflected in the Technical Data Package (TDP) supplied with this draft RFP?

**Answer 249B:** *No changes were made.*

**Question 249C:** If the problems were the result of manufacturing problems/processes at the winch manufacturer, are there any periodic tests or in process inspections required to be performed at either the winch, wrecker system, or vehicle manufacturer that the competitors need to be aware of or follow during future vehicle production?

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

**Answer 249C:** *No specific manufacturing/process problems were noted. Your inspections/tests should be based upon contract requirements and those determined IAW your quality system and control plans.*

**Question 250, Reference ATPD, Page N/A, Paragraph # M.1**

Title: Kits

**Statement:** “M.1 Common Kits/Items. All vehicles shall be configured to accept the following common kits/items. On-board electrical power shall be utilized where applicable. All kits shall be removable. The maintenance level required for kit installation shall not exceed the intermediate direct level unless otherwise specified in the installation instruction of that kit.”

**Question 250:** Will the Government provide all the appropriate kit drawings referenced in this Annex? To date, the following kit prints were not provided with the latest TDP released to the contractors.

57K4366	FLAME START KIT
57K4367	IMMERSION BLOCK HEATER KIT
57K1929	ARCTIC CARGO SOFT TOP KIT (CAMO)
57K1929	ARCTIC CARGO SOFT TOP KIT (WHITE)
57K1933	ARCTIC CARGO SOFT TOP KIT (WHITE)
57K1938	ARCTIC CARGO SOFT TOP KIT (WHITE)
57K1900	CARGO SOFT TOP KIT (CAMO)
57K1935	CARGO SOFT TOP KIT (TAN)
57K1942	CARGO SOFT TOP KIT (TAN)
57K1927	CARGO SOFT TOP KIT (WHITE)
57K1931	CARGO SOFT TOP KIT (WHITE)
57K1936	CARGO SOFT TOP KIT (WHITE)
57K1941	CARGO SOFT TOP KIT (WHITE)
57K1912	200 AMP ALTERNATOR KIT
57K1220	ROTATING AMBER WARNING KIT
57K1949	S-280 SHELTER TIEDOWN KIT
57K1970	S-280 SHELTER TIEDOWN KIT
57K1954	TIEDOWN KIT,TANK AND PUMP UNIT, FMTV
57K1955	TIEDOWN KIT,TANK AND PUMP UNIT, FMTV
57K1956	TIEDOWN KIT,500 GAL COLLAPSIBLE DRUM
57K1957	TIEDOWN KIT,500 GAL COLLAPSIBLE DRUM
57K2018	525 GAL TRAILER TANK & PUMP UNIT
57K2019	600 GAL TRAILER TANK & PUMP UNIT

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

**Answer 250:** *The Government provided the drawings for the kits to be provided with the vehicles under this contract with the RFP TDP. The contractor may request the drawings for the kits not provided from the PCO. All the drawings will be provided to the contractor after contract award.*

**Question 251, Reference ATPD, Page 129, Paragraph # M.1.11**

Title: Digitization Kits

**Statement:** Sheet 3 of the master kit drawing 12422040 identifies the Digitization Electrical Kit as 57K2013. The reference stated in paragraph M.1.11 refers to this kit as 57K2019. A review of the drawings provided with the approved ECPs confirms that the correct reference should be 57K2013.

**Question 251A:** Will paragraph M.1.11 be revised to reflect the correct kit number for the Digitization Electrical Kit 57K2013?

**Answer 251A:** *Yes. Thank you for pointing out the error. The correct kit number (57K2013) will be referenced in the specification update that will accompany the final RFP package.*

**Question 251B:** Will the missing kit drawings, 57K2012 and 57K2013, which were not included with the draft RFP TDP, be supplied to both competitors?

**Answer 251B:** *Yes, the drawings will be provided under separate cover.*

**Question 253: Reference ATPD, Page N/A**

Title: N/A

**Question 253:** Review of drawing 12414750 provided with recent TACOM ECPs resulted in a conflict between the drawing revision levels. The following outlines the discrepancies. Can the Government determine which drawing revision is intended for the TDP to be used in the bid and proposal process and provide that information?

Drawing 12414750 sheet 19

- Drawing provided with ECP U5802, revision N block states:
  - “Warranty of data correction
  - 8) 3x M6 x 1 was 3x M8 x 1.25

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

- 9) 2x M8 x 1.25 was 2x M6 x 1
  - 10) M8 x 1.25 was M6 x 1
  - 11) Dim 555.5 was 549 and Dim 85 was 78.5
- ERR SSS-U5802”

- Drawing provided with ECP U5789, revision N block states::  
“8) 3x M6 x 1 was 3x M8 x 1.25  
ERR SSS-5802”

**Answer 253:** *The Governments priority was to provide the latest TDP available with the draft RFP. Both of the ECPS U5802 and U5789 were provided on Attachment 3 CD Rom. Both of these ECPS are approved and should be included the bid/proposal process. We did not have the revised drawings in hand to include at the time of draft RFP release.*

*The reason both ECPS identify Revision N as the proposed revision, is because both ECPS were being developed at the same time and the ECPs identify Revision N and the proposed revision level, not necessarily what the actual revision level will be when the ERR is submitted. When the STS Contractor is preparing the ERR for these ECPS. One of them will be incorporated to the Drawing at Revision N and the other at Revision P.*

**Question 254: No Reference**

Title: N/A

**Statement:** Review of the LHS Trailer ECPs provided in the May 2002 TDP referenced these assembly drawings although the drawings were not provided.

12486591	Shuttle Assembly
12486592	Electrical Assembly

**Question 254:** Will the government provide a copy of the drawings listed above?

**Answer 254:** *The LHS TDP as provided with the draft RFP was in a preliminary state. It is possible that these drawing numbers are place holders of drawings yet to be developed. We will investigate to determine if these drawings have been developed or are still in a place holder category.*

**Question 257, Reference Draft RFP section C, Paragraph # C.1.2.4**

Title: TDP Review Change Proposal

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

**Statement:** C.1.2.4 “Technical Data Package Review Change Proposal.....These proposed changes are intended to correct deficiencies in the original Government baseline configuration TDP, dated 28 November 2000, IAW Clause H.4 of Phase I contract.”

Review of the TDP at time of Phase I contract was limited primarily to the test variants. A thorough TDP review of these same test variants was performed while the vehicles were manufactured. For non-test variants, along with new ECPs, an increasing list of deficiencies has been noted with both the 28 November 2000 TPD as well as the current 01 May 2002 TDP.

**Question 257:** Can the TDPRCP process through the use of Pre-production Engineering Proposals (PPEPs) be used to correct deficiencies for all variants in the Government baseline configuration TDP, dated 01 May, 2002?

**Answer 257:** *In reviewing Clause H.4 of the Phase I contract, the contractor was to review the 28 Nov 2000 TDP for deficiencies in the variants intended to be produced under Phase II. There is nothing in the clause which limits the contractors review to the Phase I test variants only.*

*The TDPRCP process can be used to correct deficiencies for all variants to be produced under the Rebuy Contract so long as the deficiencies are identified in the contractors TDPR Proposal which is to be provided with their contract proposal.*

**Question 258: Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.2.1**

Title: Configuration Management

**Statement:** C.2.1....”The Contractor's configuration system shall be able to track by drawing/part revision level and identify the configuration differences between production TDP(s) and the STS TDP.”

With dual maintenance of two TDPs, the chance for errors in drawing revision levels, overlooked changes, and other areas increase exponentially. Based on this statement, it is implied that the current Production and STS effort is being performed using two TDPs.

**Question 258A:** Are there two TDPs to maintain?

**Answer 258A:** *Basically Yes. The production TDP is a fixed snap shot of the Government FMTV TDP. Currently it is the 1 May 2002 TDP as provided with the draft RFP. Since the release of the 1 May 2002 TDP there have been changes and will continue to be changes which will update the Government FMTV TDP.*



**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

*However it is possible that not all those changes will be incorporated into the production TDP. Per contract requirements C.1.2.6, only those changes which are approved by the government and authorized by the PCO will be incorporated into the production TDP.*

*Also the Government FMTV TDP contains the A0 TDP which will require up date and maintenance that will not be incorporated into the production TDP.*

**Question 258B:** If so, why are there two separate TDPs and what are the reasons for dual maintenance of two separate TDPs?

**Answer 258B:** *See answer provided above.*

**Question 259: Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.2.1.5**

Title: FMTV A1 CR Production Configuration

**Statement:** There are a number of parts that appear to have a high failure rate as noted in the Field Service Reports (FSRs) that have been provided for reference following the ECP freeze of 21Dec 2001.

**Question 259A:** If the item in question was not a specific failure noted during the competitive rebuy Phase I testing, but appears now to be a field issue, can an alternative solution or ECP be submitted within the Phase II proposal?

**Answer 259A:** *No. The Government is handling the investigations into field issues. Based on the results of the investigations, the Government will decide on the course of action to be taken, whether it be a design/hardware modification, or a vendor quality issue.*

**Question 259B:** If it is not possible to propose a change on a field service issue given the specific ECP rules of Phase I and the Phase II proposal, would this item have to be deferred until after Phase II contract award and become an STS activity?

**Answer 259B:** *As stated in Answer 259A above, the Government is continuing to investigate field issues arising from the FMTV A0 and A1 vehicles, and will continue to develop fixes for those issues, even as the FMTV A1 CR program continues. In the event fixes (if required) are not developed prior to Phase II contract award, they may become STS efforts to be handled by the winner of the Phase II contract.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

*The contractor may submit ECPs in accordance with C.2.1.1 after contract award. However the ECP freeze is on new production changes and not on ECPs to correct field issues. There will be ECPs which will be incorporated into the Rebuy contract after contract award.*

**Question 259C:** If an ECP is allowed to correct a field service issue and the ECP relates to an option kit, how would the Life Cycle Cost (LCC) model be applied to evaluate the merit or cost savings?

**Answer 259C:** *As stated in above in 259 a and c, these type of ECPs are not allowable as part of the Phase II proposal.*

**Question 262, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.2.5.19**

Title: Cancelled Specifications

**Statement:** “C.2.5.19 Canceled Specifications and Standards. Specifications and standards referenced in the ATPD 2131C, Attachment 1 and FMTV TDP, Attachment 2, may be used to satisfy requirements even after the referenced documents are canceled. Replacement specifications and standards may also be used to satisfy ATPD 2131C, Attachment 1 and FMTV TDP, Attachment 2, requirements in lieu of the canceled document. Document replacement must be noted in the canceled and/or replaced documents. A technical evaluation shall be applied to determine the nearest equivalent requirement IAW new specifications or standards. The Contractor shall document any necessary interpretation and shall make this available to the Government upon request. The process used by the Contractor shall be submitted to the PCO for review and concurrence 30 days after contract award. This process shall follow the guidelines contained in DFARS 211.273 entitled Substitutions for Military or Federal Specifications and Standards.”

The current TPD references a great number of specifications that are either cancelled with replacement or cancelled without replacement. The effort to complete this specification review task is significant.

**Question 262:** Will the Government process a work directive for STS after contract award to update the TDP with the appropriate specifications in lieu of those cancelled?

**Answer 262:** *No, there will not be a separate work directive for updating the TDP with appropriate specifications. Screening drawings for cancelled documents is part of the Engineering Work Directive process. The contractor may also use the TDPRCP process*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

*to identify replacement specifications for cancelled documents as long as the replacement documents are Government approved replacements.*

**Question 263, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.2.9.1.5**

Title: Intrusive Testability Analysis

**Statement:** Para C.2.9.1.5 states ...The Contractor shall update, as required, the IETM troubleshooting taking full advantage of the intrusive testing and database interrogation capability of the EMS software and the vehicle's on-board Electronic Control Units/Modules(ECUs/ECMs), IAW any Government direction provided. The contractor shall obtain data descriptions and programming codes necessary to communicate with the ECUs/ECMs and subsystem, and will identify and describe them in the LMI (IETM).

The EMS software uses commercially available products such as Word and Access to produce files that allow the IETM to function properly. These software products can have upgrades or revisions posted to them each year. Throughout the life of a major military contract there can be compatibility issues with commercially available software (Word, Access, Windows) and the EMS programming.

A truck manufacturer is being held accountable for integration and software configuration management for a multitude of software programs such as Windows, Word, Access and the impact those programs have on the operation of the EMS software. It seems that the EMS software manufacturer would have more resources and software integration knowledge to oversee the compatibility of their software to upgraded or revised commercially available software than the vehicle manufacturer.

**Question 263A:** Is it the Government's intention to have the contractor provide configuration management for the EMS software or the commercially available software programs (Windows, Word, Access) that the EMS software uses?

**Answer 263A:** *No, TACOM and the EMS2 contractor will provide configuration management for EMS and related software programs, the truck manufacturer is not being held responsible for this.*

**Question 263B:** Please consider changing the wording from "...IAW any Government direction provided", to "...for any ECPs dealing with the four major diagnostic systems, ABS, Engine, Transmission, CTIS."

**Answer 263B:** *We agree with the proposed change. This will be reflected in the Final RFP.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

**Question 264, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.2.9.5.4.1**

Title: Publication Validation Quality

**Statement:** Para C.2.9.5.4.1 states that the Contractor shall correct all errors found in the SGML instance and graphics during verification.

**Question 264A:** Does this statement only refer to errors found during verification of the contractor ECP changes?

**Answer 264A:** *Yes, it refers to changes found during verification of the update of the IETM for contractor ECP changes. Legacy errors can be corrected under STS work directive.*

**Question 264B:** Please define the meaning of the term “instance” in the paragraph C.2.9.5.4.1 sentence above.

**Answer 264B:** *“Instance” is “text” (actually an element of text in the SGML file).*

**Question 265, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.3.4**

Title: Integrated Logistics Support

**Statement:** STS ILS work and Production contract ILS work have the potential of impacting similar tasks, RPSTL pages, and provisioning PLISN records with engineering change information at the same time.

**Question 265A:** Will the Technical Manual/IETM updates for the STS work and the production contract work require Final Draft Equipment Publications at the same time?

**Answer 265A:** *Yes, the plan is for the manual update for the production contract and the Expansible Van and possibly the LHS and any Government ECPs and correction efforts to be combined into one Final Draft publication to support fielding, even though they are being done under two separate parts of the contract.*

**Question 265B:** Will production contract ILS and STS ILS activities be happening concurrently and separately, or are they to be integrated?

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

**Answer 265B:** *They are to be integrated, as explained above.*

**Question, 273, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # L.2.2.2.1**

Title: Contractor Changes

**Statement:** “L.2.2.2.1 ....The offeror is required to submit updated Technical Data Package Review Change Proposals (TDP-RCPs) that correct deficiencies in the original Government baseline TDP IAW H.4 of the Phase I contract (C.1.2.4)”

“C.1.2.4 TDP Review Change Proposals. For purposes of defining the FMTV A1 CR Production Configuration TDP Baseline, the Government FMTV A1 CR Production Configuration TDP (C.1.2.2) is modified to include Phase I Technical Data Package Review Change Proposals (TDP-RCPs) as submitted with the Phase II proposal. These proposed changes are intended to correct deficiencies in the original Government baseline configuration TDP, dated 28 November 2000, IAW Clause H.4 of the Phase I contract.”

Phase I Contract “H.4.c....”This proposal should be referred to as a Technical Data Package Review Change Proposal (TDPRCP). This proposal shall contain the information required in order to correct any data deficiencies constituting an actual or practical impossibility which would preclude practical manufacturer or assembly.....A preliminary list (Technical Data Package Review Change Proposal) shall be given to the PCO by December 21, 2001... This list shall be updated prior to the delivery of the modified Government furnished vehicles. The government review and approval process for any TDPRCPs shall be set forth in the Phase II Production RFP....”

**Question 273:** Is the intent of the Phase II RFP language in L.2.2.2.1 to provide an updated Technical Data Package Review Change Proposal (TDP-RCPs) both with the Phase II proposal in the same format as provided on December 21, 2001, and with the delivery of the vehicle?

**Answer 273:** *Yes. The List of deficiencies (TDPRCP) with their corrections was originally to be submitted by December 21, 2001. The TDPRCP List was to be updated and provided with the delivery of the vehicle. A final list updated with any deficiencies noted from the TDP provided with the draft RFP is to be provided with the Phase II proposal.*

**Question 274, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.2.10.5.3**

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

Title: Training Consumables

**Statement:** Paragraph C.2.10.5.3 requires that consumables deemed necessary to support PVT training, LUT, and I&KPT shall be on hand at the respective training sites at the start of each respective training effort.

**Question 274:** Is the contractor or the Government responsible for supplying the consumables?

**Answer 274:** *The contractor is responsible for supplying them.*

**Question 276, Reference Draft RFP, Section C, Paragraph C.2.1.1.1**

**Question 276:** Since the TDP (Attachment 2) is included in the seventh sentence, should not the FMTV A1 TDP Deviations and ECPs (Attachment 3) be added?

**Answer 276:** *No.*

**Question 287, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.1.5**

Title: N/A

**Statement:** The third sentence states “The contractor shall furnish 3D Solid Models of the Contractor baseline vehicles within 240 days after contract award for cargo trucks (M1078A1, M1083A1, and M1084A1) and within 300 days after contract award for all other models.” The Government has advised the competitors that the baseline TDP is being modeled in Pro-E (3D and 2D models) for all FMTV variants. The date that the completed Pro-E 3D/2D models will be released to the contractors, however, is not certain. We understand that the intent is to have the Phase II production contractor integrate their ECPs into the baseline 3D/2D vehicle models. Consequently, it is necessary that the contractor have the Government Pro-E modeled TDP before starting the ECP integration.

Since the integration work is contingent on having a baseline TDP to start with, the contractor due dates should be tied to the dates that the baseline Pro-E TDP are furnished by the Government. The wording of the RFP section C.1.5 should be modified as annotated below:

**Suggested wording for this paragraph** (*blue/italic text denotes changes*):

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

The FMTV TDP, Attachment 2, is being converted to “Pro/ENGINEER” 3D Solid Models. The Government shall provide the Contractor with the 3D Solid Models of the Government baseline vehicle, Attachment 39. The Contractor shall submit modeling and simulation data of their changes to the M1085A1 without winch, M1087A1 without winch, M1088A1 with winch, M1089A1 and M1090A1 with winch IAW CDRL A001. *The contractor shall furnish 3D Solid Models of the Contractor Phase II changes to the M1078A1, M1083A1, and M1084A1 within 240 days after contract award or receipt of the Government provided 3D Solid Models of the Government baseline vehicle, whichever is later. The 3D Solid Models of the Contractor Phase II changes for truck models M1079, M1082, and M1095 shall be furnished within 300 days after contract award or receipt of the Government provided 3D Solid Models, whichever is later. Government baseline is defined in section C.1.6.4.1.* The Contractor shall have computer software and hardware necessary to use/manipulate/incorporate changes to the 3D Solid Model. All Contractor 3D Solid Models shall be submitted to the Government in Pro/ENGINEER format IAW Section C.2.1.1.1.4 of this contract.

**Question 287:** Will the Government consider making the suggested schedule clarification?

**Answer 287:** *The Government agrees to the rewording and will make the required changes in the Final RFP.*

**Question 291, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.2.4.1**

Title: Safety

**Statement:** This paragraph states: “. . .After the first production hardware is no longer needed, the Contractor will refurbish it and deliver it for fielding.”

**Question 291:** How, when and where is the Contractor to propose the costs for this refurbishment effort?

**Answer 291:** *The language cited is not in C.2.4.1 but rather is found in C.2.7.5 and refers to the ILS Hardware required for the development, validation and verification of the ILS package including technical manuals. The cost for refurbishment of hardware (C.2.7.5) and vehicles (C.2.8) in support of ILS effort is included in the effort described in C.1.7.2 under "Program Support" and should be priced under that category. Provision L.4.4 breaks Program Support into the following categories: Pre-Production, Production Effort, and Program Management. Refurbishment of the ILS Hardware and vehicles is included under L.4.4.2 Production Effort of "Program Support" for pricing purposes in the proposal.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

*It should be noted that the RFP distinguishes between refurbishment of ILS vehicles & hardware and refurbishment of "Test vehicles." The disposition of "Test Vehicles/Kits" is addressed in C.2.5.12. Test vehicles will be evaluated following successful completion of testing and a decision will be made by the Government at that time whether the test vehicle(s) will be refurbished. The cost for refurbishment of the test vehicles will be negotiated at that time.*

**Question 292, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.3.6.1**

Title: Maintenance Technical Representative (MTR)

**Statement:** Para C.3.6.1 states.... The maximum amount of this effort is for 15,600 mandays CONUS and 6000 mandays OCONUS spread over 5 years.

**Question 292:** Is there a minimum amount of hours that the government will commit to?

**Answer 292:** *The Government will not commit to number of hours at this time. However, the number of mandays the Government requires will be in the Work Directive. For purposes of reference, the Government on the current STS contract, has maintained 18 FSRs, 13 CONUS and 5 OCONUS, moving them from place to place as needed.*

**Question 293, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.3.6.5**

Title: Maintenance Technical Representative (MTR)

**Statement:** Para C.3.6.5 states.... The Government will pay travel costs for one round trip home visit per year.

**Question 293:** Does the contractor have to back fill for Maintenance Technical Representatives (MTR) when they are not present due to vacation or other absence?

**Answer 293:** *No, we would plan to schedule around vacation time.*

**Question 296, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # H.5.2.1**

Title: Hand-Off Warranty



**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

**Question 296:** Does the contractor have any recourse for recouping warranty costs associated with damage caused by the transportation firm, Army personnel, or other sub-contractors that process the vehicle in the time period between DD250 signing and the hand-off to the unit?

**Answer 296:** *The Government would not claim and in the past has not claimed for damage caused by the transportation firm, or during transportation, or damage traceable to Army personnel or Government subcontractors. We have a statement in the current contract that can be added to H.5.2.1-*

*“The contractor will not be responsible for any damages occurring during transportation.”*

**Question 297, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # H.4.2.4**

Title: Systemic Defect Warranty

This paragraph requires that the duration of the Systemic Defect warranty “will be from date of first end item shipment to 24 months from date of shipment of last end item shipped from the manufacturer’s facility.”

Paragraph H.6 of the current FMTVA1 production contract (contract DAAE07-98-C-M005) requires the duration of the systemic warranty to be “for a period of 18 months from the date of shipment for purposes of fielding. . . .”

**Question 297A:** Please clarify the systemic warranty clause.

1. Does this paragraph mean that each truck/trailer has a systemic warranty of 24 months from date of shipment? Or
2. Does this paragraph mean that all trucks/trailers have a systemic warranty from the ship date of the first end item to 24 months after the shipment of the last end item? This would then translate into a 7 year systemic warranty.

**Answer 297A:** *It is number 2.- translating into a 7 year systemic warranty.*

**Question 297B:** What has caused the Government to change from the requirement for the systemic warranty duration period in the current A1 production contract to the requirement now included in the FMTVA1 CR Draft RFP?

**Answer 297B:** *The Government wants to ensure that the entire fleet is covered if a systemic warranty issue needs to be fixed.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

**Question 298, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # H.5.4**

Title: Contractor Correction

**Statement:**

The five calendar day requirement in paragraph H.5.4 in itself does not always allow for analysis of the failed component. Component failure can occur due to operator or environmental conditions as well as manufacturer deficiency.

Suggest the five day requirement starts after both parties have agreed that the failed component will be a warranted item.

**Question 298:** Does the five calendar day notification time take effect after the contractor and the Government have agreed that the item it is a warranted item?

**Answer 298:** *The five days start upon notification. We suggest that failure due to neglect or abuse or other warranty voiding conditions would be the exception not the rule, and if the contractor suspects this is the case, they notify the Government, and we would handle this on a case by case basis.*

**Question 300, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.2.5.16**

Title: Physical Configuration Audits

**Statement:** RFP section C.2.5.16 describes a process whereby the new hardware that has been introduced into the FMTV TDP is audited and “approved” by the Government through a Physical Configuration Audit process.

**Question 300A:** Once the Competitive Rebuy PCA is completed and the modified FMTV TDP is approved by the Government, if legacy TDP deficiencies are discovered at a later date, will these be corrected under the STS portion of the contract as part of a STS work directive?

**Answer 300A:** *No. The Government is currently producing vehicles and procuring spare parts to the FMTV TDP. The CR bidders have been given a year to document deficiencies in the TDP according to H4 of the Phase I contract.*

**Question 300B:** If the answer to “A” above is no, what is the Government’s obligation under the contract following their approval of the PCA?

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

**Answer 300B:** *None, based on previous question's response.*

**Question 300C:** Can the Government advise if the new baseline 3D/2D TDP, that is being developed using Pro-E, will be approved through a full PCA prior to initiating its release to the Phase II production contract winner?

**Answer 300C:** *No. The 3D/2D TDP is being developed to replicate exactly the configuration identified in the current TDP. As it is released it will be incorporated into the current production contract and production parts will be procured to it.*

**Question 301, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.2.7.8 e**

Title: Provisioning Program

**Statement:** Paragraph C.2.7.8 (e) states: Pending completion of the database reconciliation process and completion of any new provisioning efforts to include all subsequent Provisioning On-Line System (POLS) inputs, the Contractor will generate a Logistic Support Analysis (LSA) RPSTL Proof....

Reconciliation efforts on other tactical programs compare two separate databases. The contractor's database called the Logistics Support Analysis Record (LSAR) and the Government's database the called the Provisioning Master Record (PMR).

Repair Parts and Special Tools List (RPSTL) data elements such as: prime-part number, item name, National Stock Number (NSN), and figure and item number are compared between the contractor's and Government's databases.

One suggestion is that the reconciliation process be removed from the paragraph and updates be posted to the PMR only.

**Question 301A:** Is it your intent by using the terms "database reconciliation process" that a comparison takes place between the contractor's LSAR and Government's PMR?

**Answer 301A:** *Yes, it is.*

**Question 301B:** When will the existing LSAR data be provided so an analysis can be made as to the integrity of the LSAR data ?

**Answer 301B:** *The existing LSAR data will be provided after the Start of Work.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

**Question 301C:** What PMR data elements will be involved in the database reconciliation process?

**Answer 301C:** *All PMR data elements may be involved. We will update the Statement of Work to clarify this requirement.*

**Question 306, Reference Draft RFP Section M**

Title: ECP

**Statement:** The description of change block on ECP SSS-U5740 states “the new installations will report to the top level 87T drawings, which will be captured in ECP U5801.” To date, ECP U5801 has not been provided.

**Question 306:** Can the Government provide a copy of ECP SSS-U5801 as referenced in ECP SSS-U5740’s narrative to the competitors?

**Answer 306:** *Not at this time. SSSU5801 is in process. It is not expected to be submitted to the government for approval until the end of the summer.*

**Question 312, Reference ATTACHMENT 3 – ECP SSS-U5771, Paragraph # 2.5.9**

Title: Test Incident Reports (TIR) Failure Analysis & corrective Action Report (FACAR)

**Statement:** Paragraph C.2.5.9.2 requires FACARs to be submitted via e-mail and CD-ROM to the addresses provided in CDRL A016.

**Question 312A:** Can the Government explain why the requirement for FACARs to be submitted on CD-ROM is needed?

**Answer 312A:** *The requirement to submit FACARs via CD-ROM will be eliminated from the Final RFP.*

**Question 312B:**

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

If FACARs on CD-ROMs are not required, will the Government consider removing the requirement for FACARs to be submitted on CD-ROM and allow only e-mail submission of FACARs?

**Answer 312B:** *Yes.*

**Question 313, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph #C.3.9.6**

Title: Drawing Approval

“C.3.9.6 Drawing Approval. Drawings shall be approved by PM MTV Engineering personnel. The Government must approve any exception to this requirement in writing. The Government Project Engineer shall provide approval by signing drawings, signing signature cards of those drawings, or by providing electronic or written approval by a means acceptable to the Government and contractor. The Government QA Specialist shall provide approval by signing drawings, signing signature cards of those drawings, or by providing electronic or written approval by a means acceptable to the Government and contractor.”

**Answer 313A:** *Initial review of new drawings occurs during the CDR and ECP submittal phase of the change process. When the ERR package is received the Project Engineer and QA specialist perform a final review of all new drawings. At that time they sign a paper copy of the drawing.*

**Question 313B:** In what step of the ECP/ERR process are drawings approved/signed off?

**Answer 313B:** *See above answer.*

**Question 313C:** What format (PDF, Pro-E, paper copy, etc.) is the drawing in during approval status?

**Answer 313C:** *ECP/ERRs are received in PDF format. The government will print out a paper copy of new drawings for signature approval.*

**Question 313D:** What is the maximum time the government will take during the approval process?

**Answer 313D:** *Usually less than 30 days.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

**Question 313E:** What are “signature cards”?

**Answer 313E:** *Signature cards document authorized signatures. These are not currently used on this program. The reference will be deleted from the final RFP.*

**Question 313F:** Who enters the signature information into the cad file?

**Answer 313F:** *The contractor will enter the name of the project engineer and QA specialist.*

**Question 313G:** How are 3D solid models approved/signed off and where is that data stored?

**Answer 313G:** *Our 3D solid model release process has been developed and is being modified through work process. When the process has been completely finalized, a detail description can be provided at the contractor’s request. All requests for this type of information should be made to the PCO.*

**Question 313H:** Who is responsible for retaining records of drawing approvals and for how long are the records required to be retained?

**Answer 313H:** *The contractor is responsible for retaining records of drawing approval. This information should be maintained as long as the company is the FMTV contractor.*

**Question 313I:** Per C.3.9.6, a drawing can be approved by one of three methods: 1) sign drawing, 2) sign signature cards, 3) written approval. What process is typically done with contractors?

**Answer 313I:** *See answer for 313A above.*

**Question 313J:** If a drawing is physically signed, how is that signed drawing returned to the contractor?

**Answer 313J:** *Through the regular mail.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

**Question 313K:** Are there any differences between the approvals of drawing revisions and new drawings?

**Answer 313K:** *New drawings are approved per answer provided for question 313A. Drawing revision approvals are provided with the signed ERR and approval letter which is sent to the contractor documenting approval of the ERR package and its components.*

**Question 319, Reference: Draft RFP Phase II**

There is no EVMS requirement/clause included in the subject draft contract. Our view is that having the EVMS requirement/clause in the contract will benefit both the contractor and the Government because EVMS is an integrated management system that emphasizes cost, schedule, and work scope/ technical performance of a program. Having an EVMS requirement will:

1) Provide accurate data for the contractor and the Government Program Manager to monitor the progress (cost, schedule and work performance) of the program.

2) Require the contractor to establish their internal control systems and procedures that are most effective to meet the requirements and controlling contract performance and produce data that:

- indicate work progress
- properly relate cost, schedule and technical accomplishment
- auditable
- help managers to make decisions through the values it provides.

It is recommended that EVMS requirement be considered to include an EVMS clause/requirement in the subject contract (Section C) and in any future contracts due to its benefits that EVMS have that I mentioned above.

**Answer 319:** *It is DOD acquisition procedure to NOT impose Earned Value Management System (EVMS) requirements on firm fixed price (FFP) contracts such as the FMTV A1 Competitive Rebuy. According to section C2.9.3.4.4 of DoD 5000.2-R (Mandatory Procedures for Major Defense Acquisition Programs (MDAPs) and Major Automated Information System (MAIS) Acquisition Programs, April 5, 2002), "the PM shall not require compliance with EVMS guidelines or C/SSR requirements on FFP contracts...." EVMS does encompass many useful management concepts. A contractor may choose to apply relevant aspects of EVMS to enhance its own internal management system but it is not considered appropriate for the Government to impose EVMS in a fixed price environment.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS**

**SET D  
17 Jun 02**

**Question 320, Reference Draft RFP Section H**

**Question 320:** It is recommended that the following revision be made to paragraph H.5.7:

H.5.7 Contractor Rights and Remedies. The Contractor has the right to inspect parts found to be defective under the Hand-Off, Material and Workmanship, and Pass-Through vehicle warranties at the fielding or using unit location. The Contractor will be allowed to take possession of failed parts following their replacement upon request. All such parts for which the contractor takes into possession will be identified by the contractor with all the information necessary to later identify the vehicle from which the part was removed and the associated mileage at time of removal. All freight charges for the requested return of defective/failed parts released to the Field Service Representative or otherwise disposed of are the responsibility of the Contractor.

The Contractor will be allowed to inspect defective supplies under the Systemic warranty to the extent possible. Because of the nature of a systemic defect, all individual defective parts may not be available. The Contractor will be provided with all documentation used to determine that a defect is considered systemic upon written request to the PCO. The Contractor shall inform the Government of any testing, study or inspection findings of returned warranty parts upon Government request. The above described inspection rights do not relieve the Contractor of its obligation to initiate the warranty replacement/repair action when notified by the Government of a warranty claim.

In the event that the Contractor determines that the defective supplies are not warrantable, it shall immediately notify the PCO and provide detailed rationale supporting its position.

**Answer 320:** *The final RFP will be revised to reflect this change..*